

Appln. No. 10/622,946

Amendment dated June 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 8 remain in this application. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

### Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Parham (Des. 425,375).

In regard to claims 1 and 7, it is submitted that the Parham reference does not disclose, teach or suggest "a periphery wall being coupled to said body member such that said periphery wall extends upwardly from a top surface of said body member, said periphery wall and said body member defining a recessed space such that said recessed space adapted for receiving the water bottle, said periphery wall being adapted for selectively abutting the water bottle such that said periphery wall is for inhibiting sliding of the water bottle off of said body member when the water bottle is positioned on said body member, said periphery wall extending along a perimeter edge of said top surface of said body member, said periphery wall having a height extending above said top surface of said body member such that a depth of said recessed space is uniform along a length of said recessed space to allow said periphery wall to extend around a portion of the water bottle when the water bottle is positioned in said recessed space". The Parham reference teaches a suction cup mounted bottle holder that fails to teach the periphery wall extending along the perimeter of the top surface and extending a height above the top surface to give the recessed space a uniform a uniform depth to allow the periphery wall to extend around a portion of the water bottle as claimed by the applicant to inhibit the water bottle sliding off of the body member. The Parham

Appln. No. 10/622,946

Amendment dated June 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2005

reference teaches the wall extending up from the base portion and extending forward from the rear edge of the base portion thereby permitting a water bottle to be slid off of the back of the bottle holder. Therefore, it is submitted that the Parham reference would not lead one to anticipate the combination of features as claimed by the applicant.

Claims 3 through 6 are dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporate the requirements of claim 1. Thus, claims 3 through 6 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 7, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporates the requirements of claim 7. Thus, claim 8 is also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Claim 2 has been cancelled.


Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 through 8 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By  Date: 6-8-05  
Robert K. Huck (Reg. No. 45,761)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931